

**UNITED STATES NAVY-MARINE CORPS
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

**Before
J.R. PERLAK, J.K. CARBERRY, M.D. MODZELEWSKI
Appellate Military Judges**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

**CHASE B. LITTLE
AIRCREW SURVIVAL EQUIPMENTMAN SECOND CLASS (E-5), U.S. NAVY**

**NMCCA 201100377
GENERAL COURT-MARTIAL**

Sentence Adjudged: 24 March 2011.

Military Judge: CDR Donald R. King, JAGC, USN.

Convening Authority: Commander, Navy Region Southeast,
Jacksonville, Florida

Staff Judge Advocate's Recommendation: CDR M.C. Holifield,
JAGC, USN;

For Appellant: LT Toren G. Mushovic, JAGC, USN.

For Appellee: CDR Brendan C. Curran, JAGC, USN; LT Benjamin
J. Voce-Gardner, JAGC, USN.

29 March 2012

OPINION OF THE COURT

**THIS OPINION DOES NOT SERVE AS BINDING PRECEDENT, BUT MAY BE CITED AS
PERSUASIVE AUTHORITY UNDER NMCCA RULE OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE 18.2.**

PER CURIAM:

A panel of members with enlisted representation, sitting as a general court-martial convicted the appellant, contrary to his pleas, of conspiracy, making false official statements, wrongful disposal of military property, and larceny in violation of Articles 81, 107, 108, and 121, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C §§ 881, 907, 908, and 921. The appellant was sentenced by the members to nine

months of confinement, forfeiture of all pay and allowances for nine months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a dishonorable discharge. The convening authority (CA) approved the sentence as adjudged.

Pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*, 12 M.J. 431 (C.M.A. 1982), the appellant submitted the following summary assignments of error: (1) that the evidence is factually and legally insufficient to affirm appellant's conviction for all charges; and, (2) that the military judge abused his discretion by denying the defense's motion to dismiss Charge III for unreasonable multiplication of charges. After carefully reviewing the record of trial, the assigned errors, and the Government's response, we find that the matters raised by the appellant do not merit relief.

The findings and the sentence are correct in law and fact, and no error materially prejudicial to the substantial rights of the appellant was committed. Arts. 59(a) and 66(c), UCMJ. The findings and the sentence, as approved by the CA, are affirmed.

For the Court

R.H. TROIDL
Clerk of Court